

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gräser (Technological Solutions to Autonomous Robot Control, 1998) in view of Hudgens et al. (US 20030110649 A1).

The Applicants traverse the rejections and request reconsideration.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

**Rejection of Claims 1-5 as being unpatentable over Gräser in view of Hudgens et al.**

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview held on January 21, 2010, and the suggestions made therein. Particularly, the Applicants discussed the importance of a teaching operation and the teaching jig in performing this operation.

As discussed with the Examiner, a teaching operation is explained at least on page 1 of the Specification. Further, on page 7 of the Specification, various components of the present invention, including the teaching jig are described. Specifically, in the exemplary embodiment that is described therein, item 3 is a teaching jig that is placed in the hand of the robot in place of the wafer.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner continues to consider the hand clamp of Graser as equivalent to the teaching jig. However, the claim requires a teaching jig. This limitation clearly implies that a teaching operation is required. Further, such a teaching jig is required to be positioned in place of an object. Graser clearly does not disclose these features. The hand clamp of Greaser cannot be considered to be a teaching jig.

The Examiner refers to Hudgens for its alleged teachings related to the teaching jig. However, the jig 68 of Hudgens cannot be construed to be a teaching jig as in the present

invention. Importantly, such a jig cannot be mounted on the placement portion of the robot in place of the object.

Further, a skilled artisan would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of Graser and Hudgens. This is at least because the jig of Hudgens cannot be placed in the end effector of Graser. If the jig of Hudgens is positioned in the end effector of Graser, the device will not work for its intended purpose. Therefore, the combined teachings of Graser and Hudgens as recited in the independent claims 1 and 2. Claims 3-5 are dependent on claims 1 and 2 and are allowable at least for the same reasons.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chidambaram.S.Iyer/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

**65565**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 26, 2010

---

Chid S. Iyer  
Registration No. 43,355